

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

A 56.7
Ag 8
exp. 2

~~Administratively Confidential~~

A Report of Proceedings

Meeting of Public Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation to the U. S. Department of Agriculture

Washington, D. C.

October 7 - 9, 1965

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PROCEEDINGS AT MEETING OF
PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION
to
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

October 7-9, 1965
Washington, D. C.

MEMBERS OF PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Chairman--John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for
Rural Development and Conservation

Executive Secretary--Raymond W. Heinen, Soil Conservation Service

Members:

Firman E. Bear, retired chairman, Soils Department
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey
Jay R. Bingham, Executive Director, Utah Water and Power Board,
Salt Lake City, Utah
Louis Bober, Bober Seeds Inc., Rapid City, South Dakota
C. Jerome Davis, officer, Indiana State Grange, Ramsey, Indiana
Lyle C. Dickman, farmer, Ruskin, Florida
David J. Doneen, farmer, Farmington, Washington
Silas E. Eakins, farmer, Potsdam, New York
Fred G. Ehlers, farmer, Hettinger, North Dakota
A. D. Holmes, Jr., representative of National Association of
Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Gallion, Alabama
Jalmar M. Kerttula, farmer, Palmer, Alaska
Moroni M. Larson, rancher, Safford, Arizona
L. L. Males, Secretary-Treasurer, Washita Valley Flood Control
Council, Cheyenne, Oklahoma
DeWitt Nelson, Director, California Department of Conservation,
Sacramento, California
T. G. Ragsdale, farmer, Brandy, Virginia
Mrs. Robert Shepard, Soil Conservation District Supervisor,
Swartz Creek, Michigan
Philip M. Smith, farmer, Williamsburg, Missouri
Dr. Henry L. Taylor, head, Department of Agricultural Education
and Economics, Tennessee A&I University, Nashville, Tennessee
James A. Whaley, farmer, Greybull, Wyoming

GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION ON THE
USDA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Eastern Section

Firman E. Bear
Lyle C. Dickman
Silas E. Eakins
A. D. Holmes, Jr.
T. G. Ragsdale
Henry L. Taylor

Central Section

Louis Bober
C. Jerome Davis
Fred G. Ehlers
L. L. Males
Mrs. Robert Shepard
Philip M. Smith

Western Section

Jay R. Bingham
David J. Doneen
Jalmar M. Kerttula
Moroni M. Larson
DeWitt Nelson
James A. Whaley

All appointments expire at the end of calendar year 1965.

October 1965

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

The conference convened at 9:30 a.m. on October 7 and was in session throughout the working hours of each day until it was adjourned at 2:00 p.m. on October 9. All members were present, except for A. D. Holmes, Jr., Jay R. Bingham, and James A. Whaley.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development and Conservation, John A. Baker, was chairman of the meeting. Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, D. A. Williams, served as alternate chairman at such times as the chairman was called away from the conference. Administrators of Departmental agencies responsible for the various phases of the soil and water conservation program, or their representatives, participated throughout the meeting.

Conference Agenda

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman addressed the committee members. He solicited their counsel and advice on the subjects on the agenda and thanked them for giving their time and judgment in guiding USDA in executing policy in the resource conservation and development field. A copy of his statement was released to the press, which is reproduced on the following pages.

The conference agenda called for consideration of the following subjects:

Explanation of Developments in 1965

Cropland Adjustment Program - ASCS

Rural Water Facilities Act - FHA

New Emphasis on Land Use Planning for Natural Beauty
and Outdoor Recreation - SCS
FS

Developments in Appalachia - ASCS
FHA
FS
SCS

Water Resources Planning Act - SCS

Public Works and Economic Development Act - RCDS

Use of Neighborhood Youth Corps in Soil and Water
Conservation Effort - SCS

Updating National Inventory of Soil and Water
Conservation Needs - SCS

These subjects were determined from suggestions solicited by mail from committee members in advance of the meeting. USDA officials reported on developments on each subject. On the second day the following subjects were reviewed in a "workshop" type conference where committee members' views dominated the discussion.

Soil and Water Conservation Problems and Public
Understanding in the Rural-Urban Complex.

Trends in Expanding Concepts for Conservation Districts.

Financing Resource Conservation.

- Private vs. Public Investment in Soil and Water
Conservation.

- Financing and staffing conservation projects.

Coordination and Cooperation between local, State and
Federal agencies.

Multipurpose Watershed Projects--trends and accomplishments.

Statement by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman

President Johnson has voiced the hope that the decade of the sixties will be remembered as the decade of opportunity.

There are many reasons why this could be.

We have struck down many of the legal barriers that kept minority groups from stating their case at the polls, and therefore, limited their participation in the fruits of this nation's forward progress.

We have opened new avenues to help individuals and communities escape poverty's paralyzing grip.

We have developed new dimensions in the conservation and use of our natural resources--dimensions that can make our soil, water, and related resources serve all the people of the nation in exciting new ways, while enhancing their beauty and productiveness for generations to come.

We have shaped new vistas in education--vistas for the under-privileged pre-school youngster of a Head Start that can open his eyes to the magic of learning to vistas of expanded vocational programs for teenagers and adults.

We have formulated training and re-training programs to provide those whose skills have become outmoded a second chance to become a productive member of society.

And we have new legislation that enables cities and small towns alike to create new jobs and new economic opportunities--legislation that enables them to face up to the harsh facts of economic reality and chart a course toward opportunity rather than be futility buffeted down the path of decline.

In short, we are moving into a new world--a world where every man and every community has a good chance to seize on these new opportunities and move forward.

What does this have to do with soil and water conservation?

What does it mean to the conservation districts, the water and power boards, the farmer, the wildlife organizations, the ASCS committeeman--to anyone interested in conservation, whether in conservation for beauty's sake or to find new ways to capitalize on the resources that he controls?

What will their role be in this new world we are moving into?

This is what I would like your advice on. Your recommendations over the past few years have been of great benefit to me. As you know, many of your ideas have been adopted.

Over the next two and a half days, you will discuss topics vital in charting the future course of natural resource development in this country.

In the past, we have considered soil, water, and related resources basically in terms of agriculture and farming. These remain of the utmost importance.

But today, people look to resource development to fulfill more basic needs--to create more jobs and increase their economic opportunities, and improve their environment so beauty can be a daily experience.

We have the legislative tools that make this possible.

Let me set down for your attention the new tools waiting to be used--the products of an imaginative, determined President and a hard-working Congress. They include:

...the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which provides money to develop statewide recreation plans and to buy and develop outdoor recreation areas.

...the Public Works and Economic Development Act with its technical assistance money to local development corporations and others to explore and plan the economic development of an area.

...the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which, among other things, provides for water development and for conservation contracts for erosion control and land use changes.

...the Economic Opportunity Act with its community action programs to wage a broadscale war on poverty and its Neighborhood Youth Corps, which helps keep boys and girls in school by paying them to carry out needed beautification, conservation, and other public works during the weekends and holidays.

...the pending Cropland Adjustment Program, which, in effect, would extend the benefits of the pilot cropland conversion program to all farmers, making them eligible for diversion payments and cost-sharing when they convert cropland to grass, trees, recreation, open space, and the like. A challenging opportunity offered by this legislation is that it would provide increased payments to landowners who open their land to the public for recreation use.

...the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, which, as you well know, authorized pilot cropland conversion, rural renewal, resource conservation and development programs, expanded the watershed program, and created the new recreation loans.

...and finally, the Poage-Aiken bill, authorizing the Department to make sewer as well as water loans and expanding the size of the rural community that can be served.

These, then, are some of the new tools. What we must do now is decide how these tools can best be used to make our soil, water, and related resources serve the needs of all our people for natural beauty, for outdoor recreation, for industrial development, for community improvement.

The President has assigned the Department of Agriculture the task of insuring that these resources--which so often in the past have stopped at the city line--reach out to the people of rural America as well.

To this end, we have created within USDA the Rural Community Development Service--an agency with no operating programs of its own, but whose job it is to reach out and perform a service function to other Departments of our Federal government so the services and programs needed to revitalize rural America will actually reach the countryside.

In the past, there might have been concern on the part of some that the wide variety of demands on our natural resources might not be compatible.

Fortunately, we have mounting proof through our Resource Conservation and Development projects and the P. L. 566 watershed program that one resource can be put to a great many uses.

As you know, the Department was authorized in March of this year to assist local people in 10 pilot Resource Conservation and Development projects. These projects cover 34 counties in 11 States.

Let me say that the results of the RC&D approach to date have proven highly satisfactory. They have shown that when local people and public agencies plan and work as a team, the accomplishments in resource development are far greater than those obtained when the development is undertaken by individuals or done through single purpose programs or with single purpose objectives.

If we get the requested funds, we intend to authorize 10 additional RC&D projects for planning assistance.

Substantial progress has been made in many RC&D areas.

For example, in the Lincoln Hills area of Indiana, local people and public agencies working together as a team have completed or are working on 34 project measures. These include:

- ...Building the first segment of a scenic highway along the Ohio River bluffs to attract more tourist dollars to the area.

- ...Planting of 300,000 trees on unsightly and eroded areas by community groups.

- ...Building of three rural water systems, with seven more in process.

- ...Activation of a new industry producing soil conditioners.

In the West Central Minnesota project, they have:

- ...Completed a 70 mile canoe trail on the Crow Wing River that has stimulated the recreation business and led to the formation of at least four new outfitting and supply businesses in the area.

- ...Built a companion horse riding trail along the Crow Wing with the help of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

- ...Established an alfalfa dehydration plant and a wood shaving plant that created 35 new jobs and opened a new market for some 70 area farmers.

In the Northern Rio Grange project in New Mexico, this same team effort has led to:

- ...Restoration of historic Fort Marcy as a tourist attraction.

- ...Completion of 11 group irrigation projects to increase the income of small truck farmers.

- ...The issuance of 65 of the new Economic Opportunity loans by the Farmers Home Administration to construct fruit storage facilities, processing and marketing products, and to expand a local weaving industry.

...In addition, local sponsors and the Forest Service worked out a new method of timber contracting on the National Forest that led to establishment of a new sawmill providing 35 full and 150 to 200 part-time jobs.

In the Penn-Soil RC&D project in northwestern Pennsylvania:

...Eight watershed projects are completed or are under way.

...Construction has started on the first of some 11-hundred homes expected to be built around a new 300-acre lake.

...And work has begun on a number of water and recreational developments, with State funds being used to supplement local and Federal assistance.

This same teamwork between public agencies and local people has resulted in more and more multiple use watershed projects. As late as 1960, most watershed projects had single objectives--primarily flood prevention. Today, 65 percent of the projects we approve are multipurpose, any many of the old, single-purpose plans are coming back in to be amended to add recreation, municipal water supply, and other features.

I cite these examples to show the broad range of compatible resource uses and to make this point: with proper help and encouragement, the people of rural America can make vastly better use of their natural resources to help reach the goal of equality, of parity, of opportunity with urban Americans.

Whether they succeed or fail, whether imaginative, creative development of natural resources takes place, depends in large measure on how well we do our job. And that means, among other things, how well we inform them of the new opportunities that exist and of the steps we take to make these new tools fully available to them.

I mentioned that Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen had been used to help complete the Crow Wing Bridle trail. The steering committee of the RC&D project and the State forestry and fish and game agencies sponsored the Corpsmen, who cleared the riding trails, developed campsites and built corrals.

This is an example of local people using a new program--seemingly far removed from soil and water conservation--to further their conservation goals.

And this is what I, in particular, would like your advice on. How can we help other conservation groups to learn about and use these new programs?

For example, what should be the role of soil and water conservation districts in the community action programs to improve the quality of life in rural America and eliminate poverty. How do we inform them of the potentials under this approach and help them obtain the assistance they want?

How do districts fit into the new Public Works and Economic Development Act? How can they use its provisions to plan and carry out their resource development goals?

What about the Appalachia program? The beautification movement? The grazing association loans? The new water and sewer legislation? The Cropland Adjustment Program?

How can they best use these programs to meet their own needs and the needs of their community? How do we help them do this, and how can these new programs be meshed with familiar legislation that has long proved useful, such as the Agricultural Conservation Program?

As you can see, I am full of questions today. I hope you have some of the answers.

It is, I know, a challenging assignment, but you have advised me well in the past.

I believe the nation's soil and water conservation districts have a tremendous potential for helping rural people obtain the benefits of this new legislation.

The Districts have the manpower, the geographic coverage, and the necessary State legislation to enable them to effectively utilize these new programs. They have proved a dynamic mechanism through which Federal, State, and local governments can work with the community and with individual landowners to solve local resource problems.

Moreover, the Districts have shown in recent years that they are ready to move into a much wider area of cooperation. Besides their widely recognized role in protecting and conserving private land, they have played a significant part in the development of resource related activities, such as the watershed program, the Great Plains Conservation Program, the Agricultural Conservation Program, and in developing outdoor recreation for pay, and in the Resource Conservation and Development projects.

In addition, some districts have entered into agreements with Federal and State agencies in the fields of forestry, wildlife, public land management, highway development, river basin planning, parks, water quality control, and the like.

I am convinced that the Districts can and are ready to assume a leading role in bringing a new era of opportunity to rural America. I urge this advisory committee to think through the ways that the Districts, and other conservation organizations, public and private as well, can contribute even more effectively to closing the opportunity gap between rural and urban America.

The opportunities to move ahead in resource conservation and development are all around us. All that is asked of us is the imagination to see these opportunities and to have the vigor and enthusiasm to act on them.

- - - - -

Reports from Committee Members

Each member of the Committee was called on to give a brief report on problems and progress in his geographic area of the country. These reports are summarized in broad terms by the following points.

- Water is a growing problem in all parts of the Nation. In 1965 serious drouth continued in the Northeast. Destructive floods plagued the South, the Midwest and the West. The greatest hurricane damage ever was experienced along the Gulf Coast. In the Midwest crop harvest was delayed and crop quality damaged by too much rain in September, delaying crop maturity. Water pollution problems in streams and lakes are mounting everywhere.
- Sedimentation is becoming an increasingly pressing problem in rivers and harbors and man-built lakes. The fact that land treatment must be effectively carried out before effective and economical water conservation can be achieved is not always accepted or given proper planning and action in all programs.
- A detrimental effect from continuous cropping with heavy fertilization is showing up in the midwest. Continuously cropped land is becoming compacted. Water is infiltrating less. Runoff is increasing. Erosion is increasing and becoming more damaging.
- Severe drouth which struck large areas of the Nation in 1965 again demonstrated the value of soil and water conservation measures established on the land. Conservation-treated land came through in better shape, with less crop loss and erosion damage than non-treated land.

- Watershed programs continue to increase. Completed watershed projects have proven that they will prevent floods. Watershed development is considered one of the more far-reaching opportunities for economic development in rural areas across the Nation. It offers opportunity for local people to take the leadership and receive State and Federal assistance in community development.
- More and more State legislatures are providing financial support from State tax sources to help implement the small watershed program.
- River basin survey studies are helping to estimate the cost of flood damages and preventions and the determination of capacities for municipal and industrial water supplies and recreation. These estimates are of vital importance in wise resource planning on a regional basis.
- Soil and Water Conservation Districts continue to modernize their programs to fulfill their role in development of new programs and in expanding the concept of conservation to fit today's needs. Many Conservation Districts had a healthy experience with the Neighborhood Youth Corps in 1965.
- Income-producing recreational enterprises continue to expand. This has become an increasing interest of Conservation Districts. This trend holds promise for a new source of income for many landowners.

- The demarcation between rural and urban populations and activities is becoming progressively less well defined. This is particularly true in fringe areas around cities and towns. Landowners and developers in these fringe areas often have conservation problems that are not directly related to agriculture. They contribute to off-site soil and water conservation problems such as flooding, stream pollution, and deposition on agricultural land.
- Information programs need to be developed to keep city people aware and appreciate agricultural programs. Additional technical assistance is needed to help the rural-urban communities to plan for orderly conservation and development of soil and water resources.
- Increased stress is needed on the fact that conservation benefits all the people and the total economy, not just the rural land owner who applies the conservation practices.
- Conservation programs are beautifying the rural countryside. Strip cropping, contour stripping, water diversion ditches, dikes, dugouts, ponds, terraces, waterways, trees and many other practices have made rural America a more desirable and beautiful place to live.
- There is still a great deal of soil and water conservation work left to be done. Over the years there has never been enough money made available by Congress to provide the necessary technical assistance to get the job done.

---Throughout the country there is a need for stepping up the soil survey for farming and non-farming uses.

---The Great Plains Conservation Program is being accepted by farmers and ranchers as a means of applying a complete conservation program on the land. Conversion of cropland to grassland is a major emphasis.

---More national emphasis is needed on conservation education. Many conservation problems are caused by indifference and carelessness. Many teachers are not well enough equipped to teach conservation. Children must be prepared for their responsibilities in the resource conservation field.

- - - - -

Press Release

On October 8, 1965, the following statement was released to the press and mailed to the hometown newspapers of Committee members.

Washington, October 8, 1965

Advisory Committee Reviews New Resource Programs:

Growing problems of water quality and quantity throughout the country underscore the urgency of continued emphasis on soil and water conservation, the U. S. Department of Agriculture's Public Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation declared in its annual meeting (Oct. 7-9) here today.

Committee members pointed out that recurrent water shortages as well as floods are stimulating rapid construction of dams and storage reservoirs. The Committee considered a proposal that treatment of land above dams to prevent their premature loss through siltation be required part of the planning and financing of all water development projects.

Similarly, the role of soil conservation in reducing flood damage, in enhancing natural beauty, in providing improved outdoor recreation, in orderly development of non-agricultural lands, and in combating rural poverty was explored by members of the Committee in reports to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Meeting with the Committee, Secretary Freeman reported on a series of new legislative tools which have been developed to aid resource programs. He asked that the committee suggest ways soil conservation districts and other public and private conservation organizations might use these tools to contribute more effectively to "closing the opportunity gap between rural and urban America."

Executive Session

On the last day of the conference an executive session was held for the purpose of pulling together the thinking of the Advisory Committee, as expressed throughout the conference, with reference to recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture on the direction of USDA conservation activities. This period was devoted (1) to a review of the Committee recommendations of a year ago in relation to the discussion at this conference and (2) to arrive at a consensus of ideas of the members of the Committee for additional recommendations.

The Executive Secretary to this Committee was instructed to summarize the points of recommendation from this conference and submit a draft to each of the members to provide them an opportunity to make comments on the draft before the recommendations are incorporated into the Report of Proceedings of this conference.

Such a draft summary was submitted by the Executive Secretary under date of October 14, 1965, to the members of the Committee. Comments received from a majority of the Committee members are incorporated into the following Summary of Committee Recommendations.

The Executive Secretary was requested by Committee members to include in the Report of Proceedings the following introductory statement with regard to the proposal to make a User Charge to farmers, ranchers, Soil and Water Conservation Districts and others for technical assistance provided in the design and installation of conservation practices.

Introductory Statement to Stand Against the "User's Fee"

One thing that has disturbed farmers and other people concerned about the conservation and development of our nation's soil and water resources is the proposed "Revolving Fund" or better known as the

"user's fee" for technical assistance for conservation. The people were and continue to be strongly opposed to this proposal. Conservation of our soil and water resources is vital to our whole society. The economy of the nation depends on an ample supply of good soil and water to provide an abundance of food and fiber for all its people for the present and for generations to come. It is in the best interests of the government to assure the conservation and development of these resources. Also, we as a nation, are making a great effort to eliminate poverty and it would be a grave error to enact a measure such as this "user's fee" which promulgates poverty.

A "user's fee" will fall hardest on the landowners and farmers who are least able to pay. To impose a "user's fee" on these farmers would result in failure of many low income farmers to get technical assistance thus resulting in accelerated deterioration of their meager land resources and a further reduction in their incomes. This fact is illustrated by a survey of 21 counties in West Tennessee during the summer of 1965. There were 105,000 families with incomes less than \$3,000, a figure which our government has declared is below that which an American family should fall. Many of these families depend upon the soil for their livelihood. They too are trying to educate their children and give them a better chance in life. It is impossible for these families to pay for technical assistance needed to help them maximize returns from their meager investment.

The net effect of the "user's fee" would be less conservation being applied, a reduction in farm incomes for those already experiencing poverty, and accelerated erosion and deterioration of soil and water resources.

Any slow down in application of practices would have a detrimental effect to the land and would greatly damage any floodwater retarding structures already built. We must apply needed land treatment to protect these structures and the Federal investment.

- - - - -

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

October 1965

The Committee emphasized its belief that:

1. The modern broadened concept of conservation and development of renewable natural resources encompasses soil, water, and air; cropland, grasslands, and forests; livestock, fish and wildlife; and recreational, aesthetic and scenic values. Protection and development of the Nation's renewable natural resource base is an essential part of our national security, defense, and welfare.
2. Soil and Water Conservation Districts are logical catalysts for bringing together within local communities all interested individuals, groups, and agencies--both rural and urban--who will benefit from the results of conservation efforts. Soil and Water Conservation Districts should be encouraged and stimulated to update, broaden, and activate their long-range programs under the broad concepts stated above. The activities of the Soil and Water Conservation Districts should be joint efforts with other State and local governmental units, with Federal agencies and private groups in planning for the best use of all our renewable natural resources.
3. Soil, water and related conservation activities of the USDA continue to be correlated with the programs of the local Soil and Water Conservation Districts in which they are being conducted, and receive coordinated technical guidance to insure that adequate standards are maintained, regional differences are recognized, and duplication of efforts is minimized.

4. State Soil Conservation Committees (Boards or Commissions) include broad representation of the general public as well as agricultural interests.
5. Agencies of State government responsible for assigning priorities for planning of watershed projects be encouraged to give high priority to multiple-use projects that benefit more people.
6. State and local governments be encouraged to greatly strengthen their financial support for competent staffing for increased soil and water conservation efforts through strong, active State Soil Conservation Committees (Boards or Commissions) and local Soil and Water Conservation Districts.
7. Each State Soil Conservation Committee (Board or Commission) employ full time, with State funds, a competent conservation-minded individual to serve as executive secretary to the Committee. Each local Soil and Water Conservation District employ full time, with local or State funds, a competent conservation-minded individual to serve as executive secretary to the governing body of the District.
8. In seeking additional funds for the furtherance of the work of the Soil and Water Conservation Districts from State and local governments and other agencies an extra effort be made, in each State, to provide for a university or other fellowship to determine how effectively the State's Conservation Districts are now operating, how adequately their work is being financed, anticipated future financial needs, and the extent to which they are able to live up to their opportunities and obligations for service in their conservation efforts.

9. Investment of more private capital in the field of conservation application, education, public understanding, and development be encouraged.

The Committee recommends that:

1. Budget requests be submitted for adequate additional appropriations to implement the broadened conservation concepts that apply to rural and urban area development programs as reflected in the Secretary of Agriculture's policies on cooperation with Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Budget requests for new activities should make adequate provision for the necessary administrative funds, including additional technical assistance needed for stimulating, planning, and installing projects as well as for improving the services of the present staff.
2. The Secretary of Agriculture further implement the procedures through which pertinent policies of the USDA can be brought to the early attention of related agencies of State and county governments.
3. The most up-to-date soil and water conservation technology be used in locating, building, and maintaining highways as a means of preventing erosion and drainage problems, and that Soil and Water Conservation Districts be encouraged to cooperate with State and county officials in road building programs in this connection.
4. Soil and water conservation research be materially strengthened, with due regard to water quality through biological and ecological as well as mechanical and chemical approaches.

5. The USDA continue endeavoring (a) to obtain more adequate appropriations for the Farmers Home Administration to meet the needs of farmers for soil and water conservation related loans, and (b) to retain authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust the level of interest rates for guaranteed loans so that more private capital will be available for soil and water conservation loans.
6. State governments in the Great Plains States be encouraged to help develop policies to perpetuate land-use adjustments made under the provisions of the Great Plains and other conservation programs.
7. The USDA further implement the projected plan of the Great Plains Conservation Program to utilize this authority fully during its term of authorization and to provide substantial increases in appropriations for it in the immediate future.
8. In addition to the necessary land treatment, every effort be made to provide the maximum conservation and multiple use of water in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Program, and that Soil Conservation Service employees and others encourage local sponsoring organizations to consider their future needs for water storage as well as flood prevention.
9. The USDA press vigorously for an immediate increase in funds for watershed planning to a figure of not less than \$10 million annually, and that the budget for watershed development be cast into a setting of an investment in the public interest rather than one of an operating cost of the USDA in providing service to agriculture.

10. The Federal Government provide increased financial assistance for water resource management, with more emphasis on upstream watershed protection and development; and with the completion of 200 P.L. 566 watershed projects annually as its immediate goal.
11. To prevent sedimentation in major as well as small water storage structures, legislation be proposed to require that 65 percent of the land above all water impoundment structures, whether built with public or private funds, have a well-planned conservation program in operation and that all financing for such water developments include funds for technical and cost sharing assistance for such land treatment.
12. Budget requests for Resource Conservation and Development projects be expanded to provide, as rapidly as possible, for the initiation of more RC&D projects.
13. The Secretary of Agriculture propose to the Bureau of the Budget joint consideration of a water resources development budget for all Departments, following the pattern developed for a coordinated river basin planning budget, and that an equitable allowance for each phase of water resources development be added to the budget of each of the Departments concerned, but not becoming a part of the ceiling otherwise established for that Department.
14. The USDA give further consideration to more adequate budgeting for Type IV River Basin Studies.
15. The USDA continue to explore the desirability of amending Public Law 566 to add water quality as a purpose.

16. The Secretary of Agriculture continue to press for removing the \$5,000,000 project limitation without the line item budget consideration established by the Bureau of the Budget on Public Law 566 projects.
17. Public Law 566 funds be authorized for watershed land treatment on Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands up to fifty percent of the estimated costs.
18. Substantial additional appropriations and higher personnel ceilings be requested to supply desperately needed Soil Conservation Service technical personnel to assist Soil and Water Conservation District cooperators with (a) conservation planning and application, and (b) follow-up servicing in watershed projects.
19. The proposed "User Charge" approach to financing a part of the cost of technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service is unacceptable. Farm operators are already paying nearly 60 percent of the cost of establishing conservation practices. The proposal would be particularly unequitable to low-income and minority-group farm operators. It would seriously curtail the application of conservation practices because many farmers would or could not pay. Soil and water conservation practices are basically for the long-term benefit of the general public and should be increased rather than curtailed.

20. Since, at the current rate, the National Cooperative Soil Survey will require at least 25 years for completion, it be greatly accelerated on both private and public lands to provide needed scientific data for both agricultural and nonagricultural users, the time lag between completion of a soil survey and publication of the report be greatly reduced, and greater State and local financial cooperation in soil survey be encouraged.
21. The ACP program continue to be directed so that it will further complement the land treatment phase of watershed protection work being undertaken throughout the country.
22. The Secretary of Agriculture give particular attention to continually improve the technical standards developed for vegetative practices in the ACP program and other conservation and land-use-adjustment programs. Mechanical practices, particularly terraces, with cost sharing from the ACP program should be continually improved and updated to fit in with modern farming.
23. Transfer of ACP funds to fully reimburse the Soil Conservation Service for technical services rendered in the ACP program.
24. In areas of intermingled private and government-owned land Soil and Water Conservation Districts be utilized as a coordinating mechanism for the development of conservation activities of government agencies and private landowners.
25. An organized plan of conservation be prepared for each farm as a sound basis for relating technical assistance, credit, and cost sharing to obtain maximum soil and water conservation from all expenditures of public funds for such purposes.

26. Some of the basic principles of the Great Plains Conservation Program be made applicable nationwide; cost sharing for conservation practices be predicated on a definite conservation plan and time schedule for the entire farm unit; top priority in cost sharing be given to permanent practices; cost sharing for annual or frequently recurring practices be kept to the minimum required to encourage conservation that would not otherwise be accomplished, and that there be a terminus to cost sharing by any one owner in any one conservation practice or program.
27. A long-range stable agricultural supply management program be established embodying within its features a sound and equitable program of soil and water conservation based upon the capability of the soil.
28. Continued increased emphasis be placed on **communities** rather than on commodities in effecting economic development of rural areas.
29. The Cropland Conversion Program be continued on the current pilot basis and that it and the new Cropland Adjustment Program be related to land-capability interpretations from scientific soil surveys, specifications for converted land use be based on technical soundness, land not suited for cultivated crop production be established in a permanent non-cultivated use, and cover for land suitable for continuously cultivated crops be adequate to control erosion and weed infestation. The soil conserving practices to be put into effect on land taken out of crop production should be the particular technical responsibility of the Soil Conservation Service.

30. In developing a maximum percent of participation in a given community in the new Cropland Adjustment Program, guidance be sought from a broader representation of the local community than was sought under the Soil Bank Program.
31. The USDA continue to call to the attention of the Executive and Legislative branches of government the need for establishing suitable mechanisms and appropriation controls to lessen nonagricultural use of land well suited to and needed, now or later, for farming purposes, except where no reasonable alternative exists.
32. The USDA give increased attention to legal, economic, physical, and biologic means to prevent river, stream, and lake pollution and sedimentation arising from improper land use, urbanization, excavation, mining, industry, water transportation, and similar activities.
33. The USDA endeavor to increase authorization and appropriations under the Clark-McNary Law, Section 2, to more fully meet Federal-State co-operation in forest fire prevention, and, Section 4, reforestation and beautification objectives of land-use conversion.
34. The Nation's colleges and universities be urged to strengthen their curricula in land-use planning, and that student advisors seek to interest more students in becoming land-use planning specialists, with particular emphasis on broadly-based harmonious multiple use concepts.

35. USDA continue to seek authority for granting Department of Agriculture assistantships and scholarships, particularly in areas of resource development, water, soils, fish, wildlife, rural sociology, land-use planning, park management and outdoor recreation.
36. Research on watershed hydrology, water evaporation, and yield, seepage, and economic problems in water management be rapidly accelerated by the proper agencies, and increased funds be made available as quickly as possible for fundamental research on the physical aspects of water.
37. A watershed research center be established for the Northern Great Plains area.
38. The USDA conduct intensive research on the impact of continuous cropping systems as it applies to (a) wind and water erosion, (b) current recommendations for soil and water treatment measures, particularly in the Corn Belt area.
39. USDA agencies recognize that their employees who work with disadvantaged low-income farmers must operate much more slowly and their accomplishments will be at a much slower rate than in the better farming areas and that, in measuring their accomplishments, consideration be given not only to their conservation and resource development efforts but to the progress they are helping to make in improving incomes and living standards as well. More flexibility in the use of funds for technical and other assistance should be allowed.

40. A Plant Materials Center be established in Alaska to serve the needs of Alaska, and that consideration be given for Centers in other areas in Continental United States.
41. More technical assistance be provided for soil and water conservation in the Rural-Urban fringe complex, but not at the expense of reduced assistance in the more rural areas.
42. The USDA vigorously oppose the creation of a Department of Natural Resources as proposed.
43. The Secretary of Agriculture assign specific responsibilities to appropriate Departmental agencies and obtain assistance outside of USDA, if necessary, for conducting surveys, inventories and other studies to guide and assist rural people in measuring present and future outdoor recreation needs and demands. Also to determine managerial and operational practices that contribute to successful income-producing recreation enterprises, including marketing and promotion of rural recreation services.

* * * * *

